

REMARKS

Claims 1-37 and 39-43 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 4-8, 10-15, 24-27 and 32-37 have been amended for form and clarity. Claims 39-43 have been added. Claim 38 has been canceled.

I. Formalities

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim for foreign priority and confirming receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

In addition, Applicant thanks the Examiner for initialing and returning copies of the SB/08 forms submitted with the Information Disclosure Statements filed on March 7, 2007, February 8, 2007, November 22, 2006, July 24, 2006, and April 14, 2004.

II. Drawings

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the objections to the drawings in view of the self-explanatory amendments to the specification presented above.

III. Specification

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the objections to the specification in view of the self-explanatory amendments presented above.

IV. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 32-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 in view of the self-explanatory amendments presented above.

V. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph to claims 24, 25, 33 and 34 in view of the self-explanatory amendments presented above.

VI. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 12-17, 19, 21-25, 27, 29-33 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Johnson et al. (US 7,159,174 B2). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

an action command is issued to a target device if conditions for execution of the contents are fulfilled

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the loading of the data cited as “synch data” onto the media player acts as the “action command issued to the target device if the conditions for execution of the contents are fulfilled.” However, Applicant respectfully submits that this fails to teach or suggest “an **action command is issued to a target device if conditions for execution of the contents are fulfilled**” as there is no teaching or suggestion of any conditions for execution of contents being satisfied when this action is performed. Further, the loading of the data cited as synch data must happen prior to the condition for execution and it is clear that no action command is issued **to the target device (the media player)** once the conditions for execution of the contents are fulfilled in Johnson.

Specifically, the Examiner cited the Mapping Info. File 234 of Johnson as the “synch data.” (Office Action, Page 6). The “Mapping Info. File 234” is used to map the buttons of the media player to particular playlists. (Johnson, Col. 3, Lns. 8-26). **The only condition for execution of the “contents” at this point in time is a user pressing the mapped button.** (Johnson, Col. 3, Lns. 14-19). **Further, the action command must be the pressing of the mapped button. As such, the action command (pressing of the button) is not issued only if the condition is fulfilled.** In other words, the pressing of the button (i.e. issuing of the action command to execute the contents) cannot depend in any way whether or not the button has been

pressed. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion of another “action command” being issued **to the media player** after the pressing of the mapped button. As such Applicant respectfully submits that Johnson fails to teach or suggest at least this requirement of the claim.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by Johnson, because the reference does not disclose all of the features and limitations of the claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1, and claims 2-6 and 12-15 at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 16, 24, and 32 and their dependant claims 17, 19, 21-23, 25, 27, 29-31, 33, and 36-37 are also patentable over Johnson for at least the same or similar reasons. In particular, claim 24 requires “a content device operable to . . . control a content device to **automatically execute the contents**” and claim 32 requires “allow a target device to execute contents at a certain time **without intervention of a user**” and “**SynchTime operable to define a time at which contents stored in a content device are executed in a target device.**” In Johnson, the contents are only executed **when a user presses the mapped button. Thus, Johnson neither teaches nor suggests automatic execution nor execution without user intervention at a defined time.** As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of independent claims 16, 24, and 32 and dependant claims 17, 19, 21-23, 25, 27, 29-31, 33, and 36-37.

VII. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7, 20 and 28

Claims 7, 20 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (US 7,159,174 B2) in view of Robbin et al. (US Publication 2003/0167318 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Above, Applicant pointed out that Johnson is deficient vis-à-vis independent claims 1, 16, and 24. Applicant respectfully submits that Robbin fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Johnson. Even taken for what they would have meant as a whole to an artisan of ordinary skill, the combined teachings of these two references would not have (and could not have) led the artisan of ordinary skill to the subject matter of independent claim 1, 16, and 24, much less dependent claims 7, 20, 28.

Therefore, claims 7, 20 and 28 would not have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Additional, untaught modifications would have been necessary.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 7, 20 and 28.

Claims 8-11, 18 and 26

Claims 8-11, 18 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (US 7,159,174 B2) in view of Carter et al. (US 7,136,934 B2). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Above, Applicant pointed out that Johnson is deficient vis-à-vis independent claims 1, 16, and 24. Applicant respectfully submits that Carter fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Johnson. Even taken for what they would have meant as a whole to an artisan of ordinary skill, the combined teachings of these two references would not have (and could not have) led the

artisan of ordinary skill to the subject matter of independent claim 1, 16, and 24, much less dependent claims 8-11, 18 and 26.

Therefore, claims 8-11, 18 and 26 would not have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Additional, untaught modifications would have been necessary.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 8-11, 18 and 26.

Claims 34 and 35

Claims 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (US 7,159,174 B2) in view of White et al. (US Publication 2004/0139180 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Above, Applicant pointed out that Johnson is deficient vis-à-vis independent claim 32. Applicant respectfully submits that White fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Johnson. Even taken for what they would have meant as a whole to an artisan of ordinary skill, the combined teachings of these two references would not have (and could not have) led the artisan of ordinary skill to the subject matter of independent claim 32, much less dependent claims 34 and 35.

Therefore, claims 34 and 35 would not have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Additional, untaught modifications would have been necessary.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 34 and 35.

VIII. New Claims

Applicant has added claims 39-43 to give a further variety of claim scope. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from their respective independent claims.

IX. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 24, 2008

/Logan J. Brown 58,290/
Logan J. Brown
Registration No. 58,290